

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 remain in this application. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are amended, and new claims 7-12 are added.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the admitted prior art of Figs. 1 and 2.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a wood chip screening method wherein pin chips are separated in a separating apparatus from a quantity of chips that are to be led to a subsequent process. A desired amount of the separated pin chips are dosed at a desired rate of speed among the chips that are to be led to a subsequent process so that a share of dosed pin chips relative to a total amount of chips does not exceed a desired value, while simultaneously directing pin chips in excess of said desired amount to a location different than said chips to be led to a subsequent process.

Applicant submits that the system shown in Figs. 1 and 2 is not capable of performing the method claimed in amended independent claim 1 since the separated pin chips accumulate in the pin bin 10 while some of the pin chips are conducted in a pin chip flow 11 into the chips to be led to a subsequent process. Therefore the system of Figs. 1 and 2 can not dose a desired amount of separated pin chips at a desired rate of speed among the chips that are to be led to a subsequent process so that a share of dosed pin chips relative to a total amount of chips does not exceed a desired value, while simultaneously directing pin chips in excess of said desired amount to a location different than said chips to be led to a subsequent process.

Similarly, independent claim 6 is directed to a plant for screening wood chips and for subsequently leading chips to a subsequent process wherein a dosing apparatus arranged downstream of a separating apparatus is adapted to dose a desired amount of separated pin chips at a desired rate of speed among the chips that are to be led to the subsequent process upon the pin chips being separated by the separating apparatus, with pin chips in excess of said desired amount being simultaneously directed to a location different than said chips to be led to a subsequent process. The system shown in Figs. 1 and 2 does not have this novel combination of features.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 6 are novel and nonobvious in view of the admitted prior art of Figs. 1 and 2. Dependent claims 2-5 and 7-12 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to independent claims 1 and 6, from which they depend, and for the additional features that they recite.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: February 23, 2004

By: William O. Trousdell  
William O. Trousdell  
Registration No. 38,637

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620